UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,802	03/26/2007	Fritz-Peter Pleschiutschnigg	HM-675PCT	7340
40570 Lucas & Merca	7590 10/14/201 nti LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER	
475 Park Avenu	ie South	MCGUTHRY BANKS, TIMA MICHELE		
New York, NY 10016			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/14/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/559,802	PLESCHIUTSCHNIGG ET AL.
Office Actio	n Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		TIMA M. MCGUTHRY-BANKS	1733
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATU WHICHEVER IS LONGI - Extensions of time may be avai after SIX (6) MONTHS from the If NO period for reply is specifie - Failure to reply within the set or	ER, FROM THE MAILING DA lable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 mailing date of this communication. d above, the maximum statutory period v extended period for reply will, by statute.	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE g date of this communication, even if timely filed	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
2a) ☐ This action is FIN 3) ☐ Since this applicat	ion is in condition for allowar	eptember 2010. action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	
Disposition of Claims			
4a) Of the above of 5) ☐ Claim(s) is a fine control of the above of 5. Claim(s) is a fine control of the above of 5. Claim(s) is a fine control of the above of 5. Claim(s) is a fine control of the above of 5. Claim(s) is a fine control of the above of 5. Claim(s) is a fine control of 5. Claim(s)	re rejected.	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers			
10) The drawing(s) file Applicant may not re Replacement drawin	equest that any objection to the ng sheet(s) including the correct	r. epted or b) objected to by the led to by the led drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is object aminer. Note the attached Office	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119		
a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some 1. ☐ Certified co 2. ☐ Certified co 3. ☑ Copies of the application	* c) None of: pies of the priority document pies of the priority document ne certified copies of the prior from the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1)	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1 is currently amended, Claims 2-12 are as previously presented and Claims 13-19 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 6-9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pleschiutschnigg et al (US 5,991,991) in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al (US 5,832,985), Mabuchi et al (US 6.096,137), JP 406100949 A and Bogan et al (US 5,228,902).

Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al and JP '949 A is applied as discussed in the office action mailed 4/27/2009. However, Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al and JP '949 A does not teach process route (a).

Bogan et al teaches desulfurization of steel being vacuum treated in a vacuum degassing unit such as an RH degasser (column 1, lines 8-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method of degassing molten steel with the process of Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 to achieve a desired final microstructure, since Bogan et al teaches avoiding expenses and other difficulties with specialized equipment (column 3, lines 12-15).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949 A and Bogan et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of JP 2000-087128 (Derwent abstract) and JP 10130713 (Derwent abstract).

This rejection is for substantially the same reasons as set forth in the Office action mailed 4/27/2009.

Claims 1 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949, Pleschiutschnigg et al (US 2003/0230163) and Rose et al (US 6,238,453 B1).

Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi, and JP '949 is applied as discussed in the office action mailed 5/18/2010.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949, Pleschiutschnigg et al '163 and Rose et al as applied to claim 1, and further in view of JP '713.

Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949, Pleschiutschnigg et al '163,Rose et al. and JP '713 are applied as discussed in the Office Action mailed 4/27/2009.

Art Unit: 1793

Claims 1, 4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949, and Gero (US 3,523,785).

Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi, JP '949 and Gero is applied as discussed in the office action mailed 5/18/2010.

Claims 1 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949, and Keilman et al (US 4,390,362).

Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi, JP '949 and Keilman et al is applied as discussed in the office action mailed 5/18/2010.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949 and Bogan et al, Pleschiutschnigg et al '163 and Rose et al, Gero or Keilman et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cornet et al (US 6,821,356 B2).

Pleschiutschnigg et al '991 in view of Pleschiutschnigg et al '985, Mabuchi et al, JP '949 and Bogan et al, Pleschiutschnigg et al '163 and Rose et al, Gero or Keilman et al and Cornet et al is applied as discussed in the office action mailed 4/27/2009.

Art Unit: 1793

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/20/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the references provides any teaching of a method that includes the steps of providing a plurality of specific process routes for producing molten steel, and selecting one of the process routes from the plurality of routes provided, according to a desired final microstructure. The examiner notes applicant's argument with respect to *KSR*. In this case, each of the elements in Claim 1 are not only independently known in the prior art but also in combination, as evidenced by the ASM Handbook (see "Steelmaking", pages 1-5 and 10-12). It is further noted that the instant claims utilize the process routes in the alternative, i.e. independent claim 1 indicates selecting a process route from among (a) through (d) as defined in that claim, and the process routes themselves are each alternatively recited with the word "or" at the end of each of (a) (b) and (c). Thus, a disclosure of <u>any one</u> of the claimed process routes in the prior art meets the limitations of claim 1. The limitation "a desired microstructure" does not define any specific microstructure; it can refer to any microstructure desired by the artisan such as those achieved in the methods of the prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMA M. MCGUTHRY-BANKS whose telephone number is (571)272-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/559,802 Page 6

Art Unit: 1793

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793

/T. M. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 1733 13 October 2010